

Applicants : Anne Marie Schmidt, et al.
U.S. Serial No: 09/851,071
Filed : May 8, 2001
Page 4

REMARKS

Claims 17, 19-21, 34 and 35 are pending in the subject application. Claim 21 has been cancelled. Claim 17 has been amended. Support for the amendment to the claim can be found in the specification at, *inter alia*, page 9 lines 5-9. Applicants maintain that the amendment to claim 17 does not raise any issue of new matter. Accordingly, claims 17, 19, 20, 34 and 35 are now pending in the subject application.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §102(b)

In the Advisory Action, the Examiner maintained the rejections of claims 17, 19-21 and 34 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as allegedly anticipated by Chintala et al (Cancer Lett 103:201-208, 1996) ("Chintala").

In response to the Examiner's rejection of claim 21, but without conceding the correctness thereof, applicants point out that this claim has been canceled, thereby rendering the rejection thereof moot.

Further, applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of claims 17, 19, 20 and 34.

Claims 17, 19, 20 and 34, as amended, provide a method for evaluating the ability of an agent to inhibit tumor cell spreading which comprises: (a) admixing with cell culture media an effective amount of an agent known to inhibit the interaction between a tumor cell and an extracellular matrix molecule, *wherein the agent is*

Applicants : Anne Marie Schmidt, et al.
U.S. Serial No: 09/851,071
Filed : May 8, 2001
Page 5

selected from a group consisting of a peptide, a peptidomimetic, a nucleic acid, a synthetic organic molecule, an inorganic molecule, a carbohydrate, a lipid, or a fragment of an antibody; (b) contacting a tumor cell in cell culture with media from step (a); (c) determining the amount of spreading of the tumor cell in the cell culture; and (d) comparing the amount of spreading of the tumor cell determined in step (c) with the amount determined in the absence of the agent, thus evaluating the ability of the agent to inhibit tumor cell spreading.

For a reference to anticipate the instant invention, it would have to teach *all the elements thereof*.

Chintala fails to teach each and every element of the claimed method. Specifically, Chintala fails to teach the step of "admixing with cell culture media an effective amount of an agent known to inhibit the interaction between a tumor cell and an extracellular matrix molecule, *wherein the agent is selected from a group consisting of a peptide, a peptidomimetic, a nucleic acid, a synthetic organic molecule, an inorganic molecule, a carbohydrate, a lipid, or a fragment of an antibody.*" Chintala only teaches that when two glioblastoma cell lines, SNB19 and U251, are treated with antibodies to $\alpha 3\beta 1$ and $\alpha 5\beta 1$ integrins, there is an increase in the invasive ability of the tumor cells. Chintala fails to teach any agent except for antibodies. The Examiner has not clearly set forth how this reference teaches *each and every step* of the claimed method. Accordingly, applicants maintain that Chintala fails to anticipate the claimed invention.

The Examiner also rejected claims 17, 19-21, 34 and 35 under 35

Applicants : Anne Marie Schmidt, et al.
U.S. Serial No: 09/851,071
Filed : May 8, 2001
Page 6

U.S.C. §102(b) as allegedly anticipated by Seftor et al (PNAS 89:1557-1561, 1992) ("Seftor").

In response to the Examiner's rejection of claim 21, but without conceding the correctness thereof, applicants again point out that this claim has been canceled, thereby rendering the rejection thereof moot.

Further, applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of claims 17, 19, 20, 34 and 35.

Claims 17, 19, 20, 34 and 35 are discussed above.

Seftor fails to teach each and every element of the claimed method. Specifically, Seftor fails to teach the step of "admixing with cell culture media an effective amount of an agent known to inhibit the interaction between a tumor cell and an extracellular matrix molecule, *wherein the agent is selected from a group consisting of a peptide, a peptidomimetic, a nucleic acid, a synthetic organic molecule, an inorganic molecule, a carbohydrate, a lipid, or a fragment of an antibody.*" Seftor only teaches that when A375M human melanoma cells are treated with antibodies to the $\alpha 3 \beta 1$ integrin or soluble vitronectin, there is an increase in the invasive ability of the tumor cells. Like Chintala, Seftor fails to teach any agent except for antibodies. The Examiner has not clearly set forth how this reference teaches *each and every step* of the claimed method. Accordingly, applicants maintain that Seftor fails to anticipate the claimed invention.

Applicants : Anne Marie Schmidt, et al.
U.S. Serial No: 09/851,071
Filed : May 8, 2001
Page 7

In view of the above remarks, applicants maintain that claims 17, 19, 20, 34 and 35 satisfy the requirements of 35 U.S.C. §102(b).


Summary

For the reasons set forth hereinabove, applicants respectfully request that all the claims of this application be allowed, and that the application proceed to issuance.

If a telephone interview would be of assistance in advancing prosecution of the subject application, applicants' undersigned attorneys invite the Examiner to telephone them at the number provided below.

No fee, other than the enclosed RCE filing fee, is deemed necessary in connection with the filing of this Preliminary Amendment. However, if any additional fee is required, authorization is hereby given to charge the amount of such fee to Deposit Account No. 03-3125.

Respectfully submitted,



John P. White
Registration No. 28,678
Alan J. Morrison
Registration No. 37,399
Attorneys for Applicants
Cooper & Dunham LLP
1185 Avenue of the Americas
New York, New York 10036
Tel. No. (212) 278-0400